

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXVIII. NO. 48.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1868.

WHOLE NO. 1,452.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

At its Office, No. 39 Nassau Street, New York

AARON M. POWELL, Editor.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, Special Editorial Contributor.

For rates of Advertising and Club terms see Fourth page.

THE TRUTH OF HISTORY.

LETTER FROM COL. R. J. HINTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

March 25th, 1868.

To the Editor of the Standard:

Will THE STANDARD allow me sufficient space to correct a slight error into which that usually careful writer, A. D. Richardson, has fallen? I find, in the second part of his *Atlantic* article on "Free Missouri," this paragraph. Speaking of the effect of the troubles in Kansas on Missouri, Mr. Richardson says of the Kansas men:

"Some paid off old scores by aiding negroes to escape to Iowa. Dr. John Doy was escorting thirteen of these fugitives, when a Missouri band, without any legal process, captured him in Kansas, fifty miles from the line. He was hurried to St. Joseph, and tried for cutting away slaves—a felony whose extreme penalty was death. The indictment charged that the offense was committed in Missouri. The prosecution failed to prove that he had ever been within thirty miles of that State, yet the jury found him guilty. But one dark night, before he could be taken to the penitentiary, John Brown, with a few trusted comrades, crossed the river in a skiff, broke open the jail, rekindled Doy from his kidnappers, and bore him home in triumph."

There are two or three trifling mistakes of fact in the foregoing, but the correction I desired to make was in regard to John Brown's participation in the affair. Doy was kidnapped on the 25th of January, 1859. On the same day John Brown was in the neighborhood of Holton, a town in the north of Kansas, to which Doy was moving his company of fugitives. Captain Brown was escorting the eleven negroes whom, on the preceding Christmas day, he had rescued from slavery in Missouri. Capt. Brown went north with his prize; Dr. Doy was captured and taken to Weston, Mo., and from thence to Platte City, where he and his son lay in jail until the 24th of March. He was then taken to St. Joseph and placed on trial there. He was rescued on the night of the 23d of July, 1859, by a party of twelve men, all of them citizens of Lawrence, Kansas, the home of Dr. Doy. He was to have been removed next day to the Missouri penitentiary, at Jefferson City, to five years confinement in which he had been sentenced. The leader of the party was Maj. Abbott, a well-known free State man, who still resides in Douglas county. I cannot find the record I keep of their names, but know that among them was Mr. Stewart, known in Kansas as the "Fighting Preacher." He died in the army during the war. Joseph Gardner, also known as the "Fighting Quaker," was another. He was afterwards a lieutenant in the colored regiment of which I was adjutant, and was severely wounded in the first engagement fought during the rebellion by colored troops, in Butler county, Mo., October 26th, 1862. He died during the war at Fort Gibson, Indian Territory. Another member of the party was Mr. Willis, who still resides near Lawrence. Capt. Silas Soule, of the 1st colored volunteers, killed by a deserter in 1864, was another one of the party. I do not remember the other names. There was a photograph of the group taken at Lawrence on the arrival of the rescue party.

At the time this occurred (July 23d, 1859), John Brown was living on the Kennedy Farm, near Hagerstown, Maryland, which place he hired on or about the 30th of June, and from which his great raid on slavery was begun. I am able to fix this accurately from data and letters in my possession. Believing that everything in relation to the Hero of Harper's Ferry is of value, I have written to correct a little error, and give credit for a gallant deed to those to whom it is due.

R. J. HINTON.

MISS MYRTILLA MINOR.

To the Editor of the Standard:

The following sketch of a remarkable woman is from the pen of MISS EMILY HOWLAND, who began her own generous, devoted work in behalf of the colored people, in Miss Minor's school, in Washington, ten years ago.

It was solicited for a *Report on the Schools of Washington*, soon to be presented to Congress. Many readers of THE STANDARD, who may have visited this school at the Capital, or aided it, will welcome this little memorial of one whose zeal of spirit was a consuming fire to her frail body, whose enthusiasm pioneered, in the shadow of a negotiating government, the great movement, since accepted as the chief educational work of the nation.

SALLIE HOLLEY.

Miss Minor's father was a small farmer in Madison County, N. Y., and she, with many brothers and sisters, twelve in all, I believe, was reared in industry and frugality. Hop-growing was one of the pursuits of the country, and the season for picking them was an opportunity for the young men and maidens of that region to earn a little cash, of which she was not slow to avail herself. She once earned seventeen dollars in this way.

Her educational advantages were limited to the district school. Her thirst for knowledge soon exceeded such limits, and how to get an education became the thought of her life. In her desperation she wrote to Gov. Seward, then Governor of the State, asking him if he could show her how it was possible for a woman, in her circumstances, to get a chance to become a scholar. He replied that he could not, but hoped a better day was coming, wherein woman might have a chance to be and to do to the extent of her abilities. She would not give up, but hearing of a school for girls on the manual labor plan, just opened, she applied for admission. Health having failed, she was accepted, with a promise to pay, after she should leave the school and earn enough, as teacher, to liquidate the debt.

She was taken thither on a bed, having a diseased spine, and a part of the time kept up with her classes without being able to leave her room.

A proposal to teach, in Mississippi, was accepted by her. Without means to replenish her wardrobe, she got credit and made purchases to meet the word that the school would not open.

This was a stunning blow. In debt, she knew not what to do, but decided to ask the merchants to resume her plying way for another year, when a call came from the South, which did not prove a deception. Now began the career which caused a sequel not intended by the principal of this Institution for the education of Planters' daughters.

While in the South her soul was stirred to its depths by what she saw of slavery. She became so possessed with the subject that her mind grew morbid, and she wrote a friend that, weary of words, which affected nothing, if this friend would raise a few thousand dollars and put in her hands, she would undertake the liberation of the slaves! and believed she would succeed. After a residence, at this Mississippi school, of two years, the principal feared her outspoken feeling might endanger the prosperity of the school, and therefore parted with a valued teacher. But the feeling roused must find vent in working in some way for the oppressed. Hence the thought to found a Normal School for colored girls at the Capital of the nation. The friend alluded to above (Editha Mrs. Thomas) welcomed this plan, and wished her to wait until a suitable sum of money could be raised to begin the enterprise. The reply was, "I do not want the wealth of Croesus in my pockets to begin."

This friend obtained \$100, and with this sum Miss Minor embarked upon her new enterprise. How she walked and talked to rouse the colored people to see the importance of what she wished to do; how out of school hours she begged money of members of Congress and Senators, or importuned writers for the press to visit and report, or how she spent her vacations interesting the benevolent, getting this aid, or in gathering the library of several hundred volumes, or obtaining the current literary magazines and papers to improve and enlighten, it were vain to attempt to tell.

All this and much more was done in weakness and in weariness of flesh, and her school became one of the places in the Capital to be visited. The President's carriage came often to be seen at the humble door, to bring Mrs. Means—an aunt of Mrs. Pierce—who was attracted by Miss Minor's enthusiasm. Such prestige held in check the hatred of the mob, which was threatening and troublesome. The city papers several times attempted to raise this lawless spirit against the struggling little Institution. But through all this spite and pro-slavery prejudice it lived and thrived. Friends rallied to aid and make it permanent. Members of the Society of Friends, in Philadelphia and other places, gave largely to its support. Among these Catharine Morris was a liberal donor, and a fine lot, with a small house was purchased for the school, and thither it was removed. Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe gave hearty sympathy and support to the work.

The school was composed of young girls from the well-to-do families of the city, and in refinement and intelligence compared favorably with any young ladies' school. The schools of the present time, in Washington, may have more technical drill, but I have never seen one its equal in spirit and aspiration.

So this zealous soul worked, till, with failing health and jaded powers, unwilling to resign the charge of her school to less competent hands, or to see the scheme carried out by methods not her own, she closed it and went to seek a recovery in California, returning only to lay aside the worn out body in the city which had been the scene of her trials and her triumphs.

EMILY HOWLAND.

IS CHARLES SUMNER A STATESMAN?—REVIEW OF HIS "WAR RECORD."

BY JAMES REDPATH.

NO. II.

BOSTON, March, 1868.

To the Editor of the Standard:

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

The next subject of serious thought among the friends of the blacks related to the condition of these colored people after the war. Mr. Sumner's first practical dealing with that question was in February 1864, when a deputation of colored persons came from New Orleans asking Congress to give a qualified suffrage to them. They complained that they were coldly received by Mr. Lincoln, and consulted Mr. Sumner and Mr. Chase as to the course they should take. They had asked for suffrage for all colored men who could read and write. Mr. Sumner offered to present their petition in whatever terms it was drawn up; but recommended them, if they had authority to modify it, to broaden the prayer and ask for universal suffrage. Mr. Sumner was thus the first to take ground that no qualification of suffrage in the South should be permitted.

He waived at this time the sentiment of humanity and of right, and insisted that the ballot should be given to all, because it was only by the votes of all that we could counteract the rebel majorities. It had become now, in his view, not only a question of principle, but a mandate of necessity.

Mr. Sumner presented the petition, modified as he suggested, in February, 1864. There was no public discussion of the point at that time, as the subject was overshadowed by others more pressing—for we were then in the throes of war and its end was so little discernible that it was not till late next year that it was thought advisable to open the question in the Senate, except by presenting the petition.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY.

In February, 1863, Mr. Sumner presented resolutions declaratory of the purpose of our government, to protest against any intervention by any foreign power. He took the ground that we were engaged in a war to put down slavery; that slavery was the animating principle of the rebellion, and that foreign powers could not mediate between us and the rebels without indirectly giving strength and smother to rebellion; that it was the duty of all foreign powers when any rebel agent approached them to tell them that their cause was unholy and wicked and that they ought to abandon it. These resolutions passed both Houses of Congress, and was and is regarded by many leading men as a great public act. They were communicated to all the governments where we had ministers.

Thus, again, the influence of the government was brought against slavery.

On the 10th of September, 1863, Mr. Sumner delivered his elaborate oration on our Foreign Relations to which Lord John Russell replied at Blairgowrie, within two days after its arrival in England—a thing without precedent in English history. This speech was an elaboration of the idea that it was impossible for any civilized nation to recognize a power founded on slavery. It was made under peculiar circumstances. Mr. Sumner had information that led him to believe that the Confederate rams, then building in Glasgow, might be permitted to escape, and he felt assured that, if this was done, war would be declared between the United States and England. Mr. Seward had written a letter, and Mr. Adams had tried to stop those rams. During all that Sumner everybody was kept in a state of anxiety about them.

Mr. Sumner, at the time, had a large correspondence with English leaders, and never hesitated to say that if the rams escaped to be employed in the rebel service, it would be equivalent to a declaration of war against the United States hardly less than the attack, at the beginning of the century, on Copenhagen—utterly unqualified; and that there was no principle of conduct that could look with tolerance on such an act. War seemed inevitable. In these circumstances, Mr. Sumner told his friends that as, from his position as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and his personal acquaintance with English statesmen, he could get a hearing in England, he would make an effort to avert it by a statement of the case as it was regarded in the United States.

This explanation will account for the spirit and strong statements of that speech. It contains a very complete development of all the principles governing foreign intervention and mediation, and a full statement of the true theory of belligerent rights—the fullest that had hitherto been attempted by any author or orator.

Maximilian had been offered the crown of Mexico, but did not enter the country till May, 1864. Yet Mr. Sumner, in September, 1863, clearly predicted the result of this intervention:

"It is obvious," he said, "that this imperial invasion, though not openly directed against us, would not have been made, if our convulsions had not left the door of the continent ajar, so that foreign powers may now bravely enter in. And it is more obvious that this attempt to plant a throne by our side would have died before it saw the light, had it not been supposed that the rebel slave-mongers were about to triumph. Plainly, the whole transaction is connected with our affairs. But it can be little more than a transient experiment—for who can doubt that this imperial exotic, planted by foreign care, and propped by foreign bayonets, will disappear before the ascending glory of the Republic." * * * The French Emperor seeks to play on this Continent the very part which of old caused the contrition of Maria Theresa; nor could the partition of our broad country—in an evil hour it were accomplished—fall to be the great crime of the present century. Trampler upon the Republic in France—trampler upon the Republic in Mexico—it remains to be seen if the French Emperor can prevail as trampler upon this Republic. I do not think he can; nor am I anxious on account of the new Emperor of Mexico, who will be as powerless as King Canute against the rising tide of the American people. His chair must be withdrawn or he will be overhelmed."

A LITERARY CONTRIBUTION.

In the same month Mr. Sumner published his monograph on Franklin in the *Atlantic Monthly*—contrasting the old philosopher with John Sidell in Paris—to show that France, in her early days, welcomed Benjamin Franklin—and now the question was whether Sidell could play the part of Franklin. It was "only another turn of the kaleidoscope," as Mr. Sumner expressed it, when he spoke of it to a friend.

RECONSTRUCTION.

We come now to 1864. During all that year the Republicans were laboring to bring about a reconstruction policy, and to get Missouri to emancipate. Mr. Sumner made one or two speeches on that subject. In the Autumn he made an elaborate oration at the Cooper Institute on Slavery and the Rebellion—still following out his idea of bringing the public mind to work on slavery, so that there should be no chance for its escape.

CIVIL RIGHTS.

During this year, also, the question whether there should be any exclusion from the witness-box on account of color was raised by Mr. Sumner in Congress. He put in the entering wedge by a proposition that in the United States Courts there should be no such exclusion. Under the old rule the United States Courts adopted the rules of evidence in force in the States where the tribunals were held. On two separate motions, Mr. Sumner was defeated, as the Senate was not yet ready to come up even to this low mark.

In 1864, Mr. Sumner secured the appointment of a Senate Committee on slavery and the treatment of freedmen, of which he was Chairman, and had referred to it a bill to secure equality before the law in the Courts of the United States, and made an elaborate Report on the question of colored testimony in Courts. It was the first contribution in our country to the establishment of civil rights to the negro. The bill became a law.

During the same Summer Mr. Sumner reported, from this Committee, a bill to establish the Freedmen's Bureau, which was the beginning of the discussion of this great question in the Senate. The debate continued for several days. In the course of it Mr. Sumner made a speech, which was subsequently published under the title of "A Bridge from Slavery to Freedom."

At the same time—on the 17th of March—Mr. Sumner made another elaborate report for the repeal of all Fugitive Slave bills.

These reports are little volumes, and contain the best summaries of the slave codes of the South that have ever been made.

FRENCH SPOLIATIONS.

Notwithstanding these labors, Mr. Sumner found time to write another book, in the guise of a Report on French Spoliations—a complete history of these claims against our government for damages done to our commerce during the Revolutionary war.

EMANCIPATION WITHOUT COMPENSATION.

On the 8th of March Mr. Sumner made a speech in favor of emancipation without compensation on the question of the Constitutional Amendment, and took ground that although no amendment of the Constitution was needed, but at the same time he was perfectly willing to put anything into the Constitution that should make it more intense.

RECONSTRUCTION.

During all this period, also, Mr. Sumner was exerting himself to hasten reconstruction. On the 27th of May Mr. Sumner presented in a Resolution the theory of reconstruction which is now practically adopted. It was offered while the Senate had under consideration the credentials of certain claimants as Senators from Arkansas. It was in these words:

Resolved, That a State pretending to secede from the Union, and battling against the National Government to maintain this pretension, must be regarded as a rebel State, subject to military occupation, and without title to representation on this floor until it has been readmitted by a vote of both Houses of Congress; and the Senate will decline to entertain any application for any such rebel State until after such vote of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. Sumner supported this resolution in an elaborate speech.

On the 13th of June the subject of Reconstruction again came up on the question of admitting the Arkansas Senator. Mr. Sumner opposed his admission and first insisted on "irrevocable guarantees."

THE RATIFICATION ISSUE.

On the question of the adoption of the Constitutional Amendment Mr. Sumner took the ground—and he was the first to do so—that three-fourths of the loyal States were sufficient to effect a legal ratification. At a subsequent day, when the question was discussed collaterally in the debate on the recognition of Louisiana, Mr. Sumner, in reply to

Mr. Doolittle, tersely stated his objections to that policy:

"He says the vote of Louisiana is needed. Sir, the vote of Louisiana is not needed; and when the Senator makes that assertion, it is interesting an obstacle to the adoption of the Constitutional Amendment. Is he a friend to the Constitutional Amendment? Why, then, does he interpose an obstacle to it by foisting an untenable and erroneous interpretation on the Constitution of the United States? The Constitution declares that a constitutional amendment shall become to all intents and purposes a part of the Constitution when it shall be ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; but if no Legislatures exist in States, is the Senator going to make that an excuse for avoiding the establishment of that constitutional amendment? Sir, I will not recognize the rebellion to that extent; I will not recognize the independence of the rebel States as the rebel States shall not count the national government at this moment, in this great period of our history, and thwart the establishment of human freedom throughout the land."

In support of this view Mr. Sumner introduced two different series of resolutions insisting that the ratification of constitutional amendments may be by three-fourths of the loyal States. Then came up

THE LOUISIANA QUESTION.

Mr. Lincoln brought forward the half-fledged State of Louisiana—hatched by Gen. Banks—and used his personal influence to secure its admission. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate, under the lead of Mr. Trumbull, were in favor of receiving it. Although Mr. Sumner was on terms of close intimacy with Mr. Lincoln, he determined to oppose his pet scheme of the hour to the utmost of his power. He could not consent to see Louisiana come in under that Constitution—formed as it was by military power, and excluding all colored persons from the rights of citizenship. He made every effort to defeat it by speeches and contrary propositions. On the 26th of February (1865), standing almost alone, he introduced resolutions "declaring the duty of the United States to guarantee republican governments in the rebel States, on the basis of the Declaration of Independence; so that the new governments shall be founded on the consent of the governed, and the equality of all persons before the law."

Mr. Sumner defeated the bill by resorting to the Parliamentary tactics known as "filibustering." As the session was about to close, the press of other business enabled him to employ these tactics with success. It is well known that he was warmly denounced for this conduct by the majority of the party. It was held up as an instance of his "utter impracticability." Yet who denies to-day that it was a wise action? For, if Louisiana had been admitted, it would have furnished a precedent for the reorganization of all the other States on the white basis and by simple Presidential power. It would have led to the admission of all the rebel States without guarantees for the future, and without protection to the freedmen. The whole case was tersely and vigorously stated, in a "nut-shell," in the concluding sentences of Mr. Sumner's reply to Mr. Trumbull of Illinois:

"The United States are bound by the Constitution 'to guarantee to every State a Republican form of government.' Now, when called to perform this duty, we are to receive and recognize the State of Louisiana. The pretended State government in Louisiana is utterly indefensible, whether you look at its origin or its character. To describe it, I must use plain language. It is a mere seven-months' abortion, begotten by the bayonet in criminal conjunction with the spirit of caste, and born before its time, reckless, unformed, unfinished whose continued existence will be a burden, a reproach and a wrong. That is the whole case; and yet the Senator from Illinois now presses it upon the Senate at this moment, to the exclusion of the important public business of country."

The Conservative papers, at the time, spoke of Mr. Sumner as having "kicked Louisiana down stairs," and predicted that this action would end his relations with Mr. Lincoln. The President, on the contrary, continued his friendship unreservedly and took a special occasion to exhibit the fact on a conspicuous public occasion.

TREATMENT OF REBEL PRISONERS.

Early in January, 1865, the Military Committee of the Senate, strongly aided by Messrs. Howard and Wade, pressed a bill for retaliation against the rebels, on account of Andersonville and Libby prisons. Although this bill came from his intimate friends, personal and political, he threw his whole influence against it and gave it no quarter. He introduced counter resolutions and supported them in a powerful speech, which was pronounced by one eminent Conservative fellow-member to be the finest Senatorial effort that he ever heard.

This speech was an off-hand effort; but there are few passages in Mr. Sumner's writings more eloquent than the peroration of this unprepared outburst:

"Do not, I pray you, consider me indifferent to the condition of those unhappy prisoners. I do not yield to the Committee or to any Senator in ardor or anxiety for their protection. Whatever can be done, I am ready to do. But, as American citizens, they have an interest that we should do great things which belong to it in the vanguard of the nations. It cannot be best for them that our country should do an unworthy thing. It cannot be best for them that our national destiny should be thus darkened. Duties are in proportion to destinies, and from the very heights of our exalted, under argue again that we cannot allow ourselves to stoop to any passing passion or resentment, to stoop to a policy which history must condemn. There is not a patriot soldier who would not say, 'Let me suffer, but save my country.'"

But even if you make up your minds to do this thing, you cannot. The whole idea is impracticable. The attempt must fail, because human nature is against you. *Nemo repente turpissimus*. A humane and civilized people cannot suddenly become inhuman and uncivilized. Conscience, heart, soul and body, will all rise against you. From every side will be repeated that generous cry which comes to us from the darkest day of French history, when the brave commander said to the monarch who ordered the massacre of St. Bartholomew, 'Sir, I have under me brave soldiers and trusty officers, but not a single executioner; or that later cry, when the French Convention, under the lead of Barrere, decreed that all English prisoners should be shot: 'We will not shoot them,' said a stout-hearted sergeant; 'if the Convention takes pleasure in killing prisoners, let members kill them and eat them, like savages as they are.' But the officers and soldiers of the armies of the United States are not less generous. They, too, would cry out, 'Let members of Congress do this work, if it is to be done; but do not impose it upon a fellow-man.'"

Mr. President, it is with pain that on this occasion I differ from valued friends whose friendship is among the treasures of my life. But I cannot help it. I cannot do otherwise. It is long since I first raised my voice in this Chamber against the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' and I have never ceased to denounce it in season and out of season. But the rebellion is nothing but that very barbarism armed for battle. Plainly it is our duty to overcome it, not to initiate it. And here I stand.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON.

Then came the Session in April, 1865, and the Presidency of Mr. Johnson. As soon as Mr. Sumner saw him, he began to press him in favor of impartial suffrage—a happy phrase, by the way, which Mr. Sumner originated. The President told him that there was no difference between them.

EULOGY ON LINCOLN.

In June Mr. Sumner returned to Boston and delivered his speech on Lincoln, entitled "Promises of the Declaration of Independence." Here again he illustrated his theory that he was bound in his public career to wrest every occasion that was given to him to the cause that he had at heart, to make it tell for those principles which he now represented. Believing that our true policy was to embody the principles of the Declaration of Independence in legislation, Mr. Sumner insisted that we must now carry out its promises in our public action.

The whole burden of the eulogy was to view Mr. Lincoln as the representative of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and to urge the country to complete the work that he had begun in that direction. At this time Mr. Johnson was beginning his reconstruction policy in North Carolina—putting rebels in office, and men who could not take the oath.

DEMAND FOR GUARANTEES.

Mr. Sumner's next public effort was a speech at the Republican State Convention in Worcester, on "The National Security and the National Faith: Guarantees for the National Freedmen and the National Creditor." In this speech he laid down the guarantees that we should ask. The President was whipping up reconstruction so as to have the rebel States ready for admission at the meeting of Congress.

He was disappointed that they did not come up to time. Of course his policy contemplated a complete abandonment of the freedmen.

Mr. Sumner's speech specifies all the requirements that are necessary for the establishment of a just reconstruction. He depicted the danger to the national debt and the national freedmen, if the rebels should get back without any guarantees, and brought up as an illustration his famous account of the Dikes of Holland:

"Such are the supreme objects now at heart—the National Security and the National Faith, or the two absorbed into one, Security for the Future."

THE DIKES OF HOLLAND.

"And here allow me to present an illustration, which, unless I mistake, will make our duty clear. You do not forget the immense and costly dikes, built by Holland against the sea; but, perhaps, you may not call to mind their origin and importance. Before these embankments were constructed the whole of the country was in constant danger. At an early period there was an interruption which destroyed no less than forty-four villages, followed very soon by another which destroyed eighty thousand lives. In the fifteenth century there was still another which swept away one hundred thousand persons—a terrible sacrifice, even greater in proportion to the population of Holland at that time, than what we have been called to bear from the bloody interruption of slavery. At last the dikes were constructed as safeguards, and down to this day they are preserved at a large annual cost. Precautions of all kinds are superadded. A special corps of engineers, educated at Delft, is constantly employed in the work of renovation. Watchmen patrol the walls, and alarm bells are ready to ring. The gratings of the people show itself even to its unconquered protectors; and the stork, which rests here on its flight from Africa, destroys the vermin that weaken and sap the dikes, is held in veneration, so that to kill a stork is looked upon as little less than a crime. Such are some of the defenses by which Holland is guarded against danger from the sea. But how petty is her danger compared with ours! We too, must have our dikes, with engineers to keep them strong—with watchmen to patrol them—with alarm bells to ring; and we, too, must have our storks to destroy the vermin that weaken and sap our embankments."

OUR DIKES ARE GUARANTEES.

"What shall be our defenses? How shall we guard against destructive interruptions? And where shall we establish our security for the future? Our embankments must not be of earth. Walls of stone will not do. Towers, ramparts and buttresses will be impotent against our vindictive tide. The security we seek must be found in organic law with irrevocable guarantees; and these irrevocable guarantees must be co-extensive with the danger."

The guarantees demanded by Mr. Sumner were, the inviolable unity of the Republic; the enfranchisement of the freedmen; their equality before the law; the irrepealability of the national debt; the abjurement of the rebel debt and the education of the people. It was the first time that guarantees had been spoken of by any of our public men.

There is one fine passage in Mr. Sumner's rehearsal of the guarantees required which I would like to quote:

"In obtaining guarantees, we must rely upon acts rather than professions, and light our footsteps by the lamp of experience. Therefore, we turn from recent rebels to constant loyalists. This is the ordinary prudence. As those who have fought against us should be disfranchised, so those who fought for us should be enfranchised, and thus a renovated State will be built secure on an unflinching and natural loyalty. For while the freedman will take the place of the master, thus verifying the saying that the last shall be first and the first shall be last. In the present books of the East it is declared, that the greatest mortification at the day of judgment will be when the faithful slave is carried to Paradise, and the wicked master is sent to hell; and this same reversal of conditions appears in the gospel when Dives is exhibited as suffering the pains of damnation while the beggar of other days is sheltered in Abraham's bosom. Therefore, we organize this change, we allow divine justice. Surely nobody can doubt that Robert Small, the heroic slave, who carried a rebel steamer to our fleet and then became a pilot, deserves more of the Republic than a South Carolina official, occupied at that very time as Commissioner to regulate impressments in the rebel army. To accept the latter and to reject the former will be not only the height of injustice, but the height of meanness. It will be a deed 'to make heaven weep, all earth amazed.'"

THE DEMOCRACY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE sent all the way to Iowa for an orator to plead their cause, and imported Henry Clay Dean. Here is a sample of the talk on which he regaled his Democratic auditors during his labors for the New Hampshire Democracy:

"If I could have my way, I would place Jeff. Davis in Congress, where he rightfully belongs; then I would go to Concord, take all those miserable battle-flags from the State House, and make a bonfire of them in the State House yard; then I would go all through the North, and destroy all the monuments and grave-stones erected to the memory of soldiers; in short, I would put out of sight everything which reminds us that we ever had a war with our Southern brethren. I do not know that I would hang one-legged and one-armed soldiers, but I would pray to God to get them out of our way as soon as possible."

A NEW YORK correspondent of the *Chicago Journal* writes:

"I am struck with the belief that I perceive all circles that the removal of the President will bring heavy business men, who have time and again brought revolution, but that impeachment would be sure to bring that they now hoped the thing would go through, because of the business interests of the country. Although they believed the President had not intentionally violated the law, they thought the controversy ought to be brought to an end, and the fight to be ended by the removal of one party to the field, it was best to have him removed; and others who can tell you much more than I can, but the statement of such noble Christian men as Messrs. Horner, of Mobile, and others, with whom I have freely conversed, are entitled to great weight. It is their judgment that Northern men have little idea of the violence which Johnson's policy has engendered in the class who will live and die disloyal."

and who are struggling for control of the negro.—*New Bedford (Mass.) Standard.*

RECONSTRUCTION IN ARKANSAS.

The way reconstruction is prosecuted in Arkansas is illustrated by the following editorial account contained in the *Little Rock (Ark.) Republican*, of March 18:

We have just learned from a messenger who left Austin last evening, of the election at the Little Rock. This place is about thirty-five miles from the Little Rock. Our informant states that the confederates took possession of the polls, and compelled the colored voters, and thirty odd in number, to vote the rebel ticket; that the voters acknowledged that they wished to vote the Republican ticket, but did not dare to do so for fear of their lives. The ex-rebels, the meanest, perhaps, in the State, drove the messenger from the polls, and, following him several miles homeward, fired on him with pistols.

Now, then, let these whelps be arrested forthwith, and taught a lesson which will remember. That place has the reputation of being the most thoroughly rebellious in this part of the State, and we hope the military will not only order a new election at that point, but that it will be held in such a vigorous and thorough-going manner that the ex-rebel horde will be put upon their good behavior hereafter.

AUGUSTA, March 14.

To Jas. L. Hodges, Thos. M. Bowen, Joseph Brooks, Commissioners: The deputy sheriff prevented the civil election at Cotton Plant by force. Send me orders immediately. D. P. UPHAM, Special Commissioner.

On yesterday we called attention to the conduct of the anti-reconstructionists at the polls in Austin, Prairie County, on the day of election.

To-day we have to chronicle, as will be seen by the dispatch published above, another evidence of the systematic violence and intimidation which the ex-rebel leaders have advised their turbulent cohorts to pursue in the present campaign. It will be observed that their followers have adopted the advice given them, and are promptly and vigorously acting upon it. They are making up a record which will be duly proven and remembered.

Fortunately the provisions of the schedule for holding the civil or State election will not provide for just such occurrences as these. When it is considered that this civil election is fully authorized by the recent act of Congress, it will be seen that a high-handed proceeding it was on the part of this deputy sheriff to interfere with the voting at those polls. So the ex-rebel leaders will make nothing by their motion.

We understand that some of their tools admitted that these leaders were very doubtful about defeating the new Constitution, but that they had determined to do so at all hazards; and, if they thought it became necessary, to accomplish this end, to resort to the means which we see they have employed at Austin, and in Woodruff County.

The mistake Congress made, and which has caused already too much expense and delay, was in submitting the work of reconstruction at all to such a perverse and rebellious people. While amongst the masses of the South there are many persons who, if they could be brought from under the control of their old leaders, are undoubtedly disposed to be honest and loyal citizens, yet it has always seemed to us that reconstruction should have been decided by the vote and action of the exclusively loyal people.

TERRORISM IN TENNESSEE.

From the New York Tribune.

Bill-Heads, Posters, Cards, etc., 500-
ness and accuracy.